droplet diameter and its influence on wellhead ejection behavior) adequately characterized? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

3. Was the physical model for multi-phase flow adequately developed to capture the liquid droplet phase and the gas-phase flow field? Were the soot and radiation models adequately characterized? Were Lagrangian droplet dynamics and thermophysics adequately incorporated into the model? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

4. Does the droplet injection model adequately simulate realistic diameters and velocities of two-phase, high-speed flows that would occur during a wellhead blowout event? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

5. Does the validation process capture the controlling physical properties to a sufficient level of accuracy, including transport and boundary conditions at the bench- and intermediate-scales for both gas-phase and two-phase turbulent spray? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

6. Were the phase doppler anemometry and diffuse back-light illumination imaging diagnostic methods (6.1.1 and 6.1.2 below) for the droplet behavior measurements appropriately designed, clearly described, and adequate to capture droplet behavior for the Gas Phase and Two-Phase Spray Flame? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

6.1.1. Phase Doppler Anemometry

6.1.2. Diffuse Back-Illumination Imaging

7. Were the diagnostic methods (7.1.1 and 7.1.2 below) for the temperature measurements appropriately designed, clearly described, and adequate to capture temperature for the Gas Phase and Two-Phase Spray Flame? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

7.1.1. Coherent Anti-Stokes Raman Spectrometry-based Thermometry (CARS)

7.1.2. 3-Color High-Speed Pyrometry

8. Do the results adequately characterize evidence of the droplet characteristics, including droplet breakup, the droplet size (diameter), droplet speed, and the duration of a droplet in fire (bench- and intermediate-scales)? Does the research product accurately expand predictions of droplet diameters beyond current limited validated ranges? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

9. Does the research product accurately characterize the impact of two-phase flow regimes (bubble, slug, and churn) on the effluent plume (bench- and intermediate-scales)? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Provide an explanation for your answers.

10. Does the research product adequately address how the wellbore flow would influence the ejected spray plume behavior, which directly influences how the oil and gas burns and how much will either fall back to the surface or remain vapor? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Explain your answers.

11. Does the research product accurately predict the length of fire plume, location of flame anchoring, height of flame, width/angle, expansion, etc.? Were there any apparent strengths, weaknesses, omissions, or errors? Explain your answers.

12. Does the research product determine the primary mechanism driving burn efficiency?

13. Were the conclusions based on the OSRR 1063 study findings in the report logical and appropriate based on the results? What other conclusions related to the study were made and are appropriate? Are there any additional study findings or conclusions that could be drawn from the study? Provide an explanation for your answers.

Background on OSRR 1063 Study

BSEE oversees oil spill planning and preparedness for oil and gas exploration, development, and production facilities in both state and Federal offshore waters of the United States. BSEE's Oil Spill Preparedness Division (OSPD) is responsible for promulgating regulations pursuant to BSEE's delegated authority under the Clean Water Act, as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1321), and implementing those regulations (30 CFR part 254).

To receive the necessary approvals under 30 CFR part 254, operators of oil and gas facilities operating seaward of the coastline must demonstrate that they are prepared to respond to a loss of well control event and a ''worst case'' discharge release (30 CFR 254.26; 254.51–.53). For decades, intentional wellhead ignition has been viewed as a possible source control method for well-head blowouts in ice-bound environments. BSEE is researching this response method to better understand its efficiencies and limitations in the North Slope area of Alaska. As part of this review process, BSEE contracted the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) to first conduct a review of an interested party's report and related scientific literature and provide preliminary technical guidance on the feasibility of wellhead burning as a mitigation method. The review suggests scientific evidence is lacking to fully support claims that wellhead burning would be highly efficient and would result in little to no unburned oil fallout for the proposed project. BSEE then contracted NRL to conduct a scientific research project. The research project's primary objective was to develop a CFD model of wellhead burning validated with experimental data at multiple scales. BSEE is seeking an independent peer review of the interim final NRL report for this research program titled *OSRR 1063: BSEE Report: CFD Model for Predicting Wellhead Oil-Burning Efficiency at Bench and Intermediate Scales: Interim Report* (July 30, 2020).

BSEE considers this study to be a highly influential scientific assessment.

Scott A. Angelle,

Director, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2021–00148 Filed 1–7–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–VH–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1469 (Final)]

Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products From Brazil; Termination of Investigation

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On January 4, 2021, the Department of Commerce published notice in the **Federal Register** of a negative final determination of sales at less than fair value in connection with the subject investigation concerning Brazil (86 FR 70). Accordingly, the antidumping duty investigation concerning wood mouldings and millwork products from Brazil (Investigation No. 731–TA–1469 (Final)) is terminated.

DATES: January 4, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Keysha Martinez (202–205–2136), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (*https://www.usitc.gov*). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.*

Authority: This investigation is being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 and pursuant to section 207.40(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.40(a)). This notice is published pursuant to section 201.10 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 201.10).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: January 5, 2021.

Lisa Barton,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 2021–00140 Filed 1–7–21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–1184]

Certain Shaker Screens for Drilling Fluids, Components Thereof, and Related Materials; Commission Determination To Review-nn-Part an Initial Determination Granting Summary Determination of Violation of Section 337; Request for Written Submissions on Remedy, the Public Interest, and Bonding

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review-in-part an initial determination (''ID'') (Order No. 20) issued by the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') granting a motion for summary determination of violation of section 337. The Commission requests written submissions from the parties, interested government agencies, and interested persons on the issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding, under the schedule set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Benjamin S. Richards, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708–5453. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at *https://edis.usitc.gov.* For help accessing EDIS, please email *EDIS3Help@usitc.gov.* General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server at *https://www.usitc.gov.* Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on November 21, 2019, based on a complaint, as amended, filed by M–I L.L.C. of Houston, Texas (''M–I''). 84 FR 64339 (Nov. 21, 2019). The amended complaint alleged violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain shaker screens for drilling fluids, components thereof, and related marketing materials by reason of infringement of: (1) Certain claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,210,582 (''the '582 patent''), 7,810,649 (''the '649 patent''), and (''the '735 patent'');; and (2) U.S. Trademark Registration Nos. 2,151,736 and 2,744,891. *Id.* The Commission's notice of investigation named six respondents, including Anping Shengjia Hardware Mesh Co., Ltd. (''SJ Screen'') and Hebei Hengying Wire Cloth Co. Ltd (''Hengying Wire Cloth'') (collectively the ''Defaulting Respondents''). *Id.* at 64339–40. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (''OUII'') is participating in this investigation. *Id.* at 64340.

On February 5, 2020, the Commission found SJ Screen and Hengying Wire Cloth in default. Order No. 10, *unreviewed,* Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 704161 (Mar. 5, 2020). Thereafter, and after the termination of the other remaining respondents by consent order, *see* Order No. 8, *unreviewed,* Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 701736 (Feb. 6, 2020); Order No. 14, *unreviewed,* Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 708798 (Apr. 23, 2020), M–I withdrew all of its trademark-based allegations, as well as claims 2–11 of the '582 patent; claims 2–7 and 9 of the '649 patent; and claims 2–9, 13, 16, and 18–19 of the '735 patent from the investigation. *See* Order No. 19, *unreviewed,* Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 720447 (Sept. 24, 2020).

On August 27, 2020, M–I filed a motion for summary determination that the Defaulting Respondents violated section 337 and that M–I satisfies the domestic industry requirement of section 337. The motion sought issuance of a general exclusion order (''GEO'') and imposition of a one hundred percent (100%) bond on accused products imported during the Presidential review period. On September 16, 2020, OUII filed a response supporting M–I's motion, including the remedial relief requested therein.

On November 19, 2020, the ALJ issued the subject ID granting M–I's motion and recommending issuance of a GEO and imposition of a bond in the amount of 100 percent of the entered value of infringing products. Specifically, the ID found that (1) the Commission has jurisdiction over the products, the parties, and the investigation; (2) the importation requirement is satisfied; (3) M–I has standing to bring this investigation; (4) all of the remaining asserted claims are infringed by one or more of the Defaulting Respondents' products; and (5) M–I has satisfied the domestic industry requirement of section 337. Additionally, the ALJ recommended that the Commission issue a GEO and impose a bond in the amount of one hundred percent (100%) of the entered value of infringing articles imported during the period of Presidential review.

The Commission has determined to review the ID's finding that M–I's investments in plant and equipment and M–I's employment of labor and capital are significant under section 337(a)(3)(A) and (B). The Commission has determined not to review the remainder of the ID.

In connection with the final disposition of this investigation, the statute authorizes issuance of, *inter alia,* (1) an exclusion order that could result in the exclusion of the subject articles from entry into the United States and/or (2) cease and desist orders that could result in the respondents being required to cease and desist from engaging in unfair acts in the importation and sale of such articles. Accordingly, the Commission is interested in receiving written submissions that address the form of remedy, if any, that should be ordered. If a party seeks exclusion of an article from entry into the United States for purposes other than entry for consumption, the party should so indicate and provide information establishing that activities involving